## REMARKS

The title, claims and drawings have been amended without adding new matter in order to correct minor informalities and to address other issues raised by the Examiner. New claims 51-56 have been added. Claims 1, 4-5, 23 and 26-27 have been amended. Claims 6-9 and 28-31 have been canceled. Forty eight claims remain pending in the application: Claims 1-5, 10-27, and 32-56. Reconsideration of the pending claims in view of the amendments above and remarks below is respectfully requested.

By way of this amendment, Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims and application in condition for allowance. However, should there remain any outstanding issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned at (858) 552-1311 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Turning to the specific objections and rejections:

1. Objection to the Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the Drawings noting the Draftsperson's Drawing Review. Applicants have provided replacement formal drawings that address the Draftsperson's objections. Therefore, Applicants believe that the formal drawings now satisfy all of the requirements and respectfully request the objections be withdrawn.

2. Objections to the Title

The Examiner has objected to the Title as not being descriptive. Applicants have amended the Title to be more descriptive as recommended by the Examiner.

3. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5, 8, 10, 11, 16, 17, 19-25, 27, 30, 32, 33, 38, 39, and 41-44 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,005,565 (Legall et al.). Applicants respectfully submit, however, that the Legall reference fails to teach each element as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 23. More specifically, claim 1 for example recites in part:

> a circuit that receives wireless television communication signals, the wireless television communication signals including sensory data and programming data related to the sensory data and converts the wireless television communication signals into digital signals comprising at least one of the programming data and the sensory data;
>
> a circuit that receives computer network communication signals;
>
> a circuit that receives the digital signals and facilitates communication is coupled with both the circuit that receives wireless television communication signals and the circuit that receives computer network communication signals, wherein the circuit that facilitates communication facilitates communication between the circuit that receives wireless television communication signals and the circuit that receives computer network communication signals, including facilitating the transfer of commands and the digital signals between the circuit that receives wireless television communication signals and the circuit that receives computer network communication signals ....

As such, amended claim 1 provides for three circuit elements, one receives the wireless television communication signals, one receives the computer network communication signals and one facilitates the communication between the previous defined circuits. The Legall reference fails to teach or suggest an intervening third circuit that facilitates communication between circuits receiving communication signals. The Application as filed provides support throughout the Specification for the amendments to claim 1. For example, the circuit that receives the digital signals and facilitates communication can, in some embodiments, be buffer logic 204, as shown in at least FIG. 2 and described in part at page 5, line 28 through page 6, line 2.

Alternatively, the Legall reference only shows a receiver 105 and a processor system 100. The Legall reference fails to show at least a circuit coupled with both the circuit that receives wireless television signals and the circuit that receives computer network signals. Additionally, there is no circuit element described in the Legall reference that "facilitates communication between the circuit that receives wireless television communication signals and the circuit that receives computer network communication signals." Therefore, the Legall reference fails to teach or suggest each element of amended claim 1, and thus claim 1 is not anticipated by the Legall reference.

Similarly, the other references applied by the Examiner also fail to teach or suggest a circuit that facilitates communication between the circuit that receives wireless television communication signals and the circuit that receives computer network communication signals. Therefore, the claims that depend from claim 1 are also not anticipated or obvious over the Legall reference or the Legall reference in combination with the other applied references.

Amended claim 23 is also not anticipated by the Legall reference. Claim 23 recites in part, for example:

> receiving wireless television communication signals in a first circuit, the wireless television communication signals including sensory data and programing data related to the sensory data;
>
> receiving computer network communication signals in a second circuit;
>
> buffering and controlling the transfer of commands and at least portions of the sensory data and the programming data between the first and second circuits through a third circuit;
>
> displaying the received wireless television communication signals and the received computer network communication signals on the television ....

The Legall reference does not teach or suggest at least buffering and controlling the transfer of commands and sensory data and programming data between the first and

second circuits through a third circuit. Therefore, the Legall reference also fails to teach each element of amended claim 23, and thus amended claim 23 is also not anticipated by the Legall reference.

Further, none of the applied references teach or suggest buffering and controlling the transfer of commands, sensory data and programming data through a third circuit. Therefore, amended claim 23 and the dependent claims that depend from claim 23 are also not anticipated or obvious in view of the Legall reference or any combination of the applied references.

4. The Examiner has further rejected claims 4, 6, 7, 9, 26, 28, 29 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being obvious over the Legall reference. However, as described above, the Legall reference fails to teach or suggest the apparatus as recited in amended claim 1 or the method as recited in amended claim 23. More specifically, the Legall reference fails to teach or suggest "a circuit that receives the digital signals and facilitates communication" as recited in amended claim 1 and further fails to teach or suggest "buffering and controlling the transfer of commands and at least portions of the sensory data and the programming data ... through a third circuit" as recited in amended claim 23. Therefore, the claims that depend from independent claims 1 and 23 are also not obvious over the Legall reference for at least the reasons provided above with respect to claims 1 and 23.

5. The Examiner additionally rejected claims 18 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over the Legall reference in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,081,626 (Maekawa et al.). Claims 18 and 40, however, depend from independent claims 1 and 23, respectively. As demonstrated above, the Legall reference fails to teach or suggest the apparatus as recited in claim 1 or the method as recited in claim 23.

The Maekawa reference also fails to teach or suggest at least a circuit that facilitates communication between the circuit that receives wireless television communication signals and the circuit that receives computer network communication signals as recited in amended claim 1, or buffering and controlling the transfer of commands, sensory data and programming data through a third circuit as recited in amended claim 23. Therefore, the combination of the Legall and Maekawa references fails to teach or make obvious the apparatus and method of claims 18 and 40.

6. Claims 12, 13, 34 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over the Legall reference in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,208,384 (Schultheiss). Claims 12 and 13 depend from claim 1, and claims 34 and 35 depend from claim 23. The Schultheiss reference also fails to teach or suggest at least a circuit that facilitates communication between the circuit that receives wireless television communication signals and the circuit that receives computer network communication signals as recited in amended claim 1; or buffering and controlling the transfer of commands, sensory data and programming data through a third circuit as recited in amended claim 23. Therefore, the combination of the Legall and Schultheiss references fails to teach or make obvious the apparatus and method of amended claims 12, 13, 34 and 35 for at least the reasons provided above for claims 1 and 23.

7. The Examiner further rejected claims 14, 15, 36 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Legall in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,216,264 (Maze et al.). Again, the Legall reference fails to teach or make obvious the apparatus of amended claim 1 or the method of claim 23. The Maze reference also fails to teach or suggest at least a circuit that facilitates communication between the circuit that receives wireless television communication signals and the circuit that receives computer network

communication signals as recited in amended claim 1, or buffering and controlling the transfer of commands, sensory data and programming data through a third circuit as recited in amended claim 23. Therefore, the combination of the Legall and Maze references fails to teach or make obvious the apparatus and method of depended claims 14, 15, 36 and 37 for at least the reasons provided above.

8. Claims 45-48 and 50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,923,379 (Patterson) in view of the Legall reference. Amended independent claim 45, however, recites in part:

> a digital satellite system (DSS) processing element communicatively connected to at least one satellite communications channel for receiving digital communication signals, the received digital communication signals including sensory data and programming data related to the sensory data, the DSS processing element converting the received digital communication signals into a form that can be displayed on the television, the DSS processing element generating an option palette that can be displayed on the television, the option palette having a plurality of icons that facilitate a user's navigation through the converted digital communication signals; and
>
> an Internet processing element communicatively connected to the Internet for receiving computer network communication signals and converting the received computer network communication signals into a form that can be displayed on the television, the Internet processing element receiving the converted digital communication signals and the option palette from the DSS processing element and displaying the converted digital communication signals, the converted computer network communication signals, and the option palette on the television.

The Patterson and the Legall references both fail to teach or suggest at least a DSS processing element generating an option palette, an Internet processing element receiving converted digital communication signals from the DSS processing element, or the Internet processing element receiving the option palette from the DSS processing element.

The Examiner suggests that the Patterson reference teach an internet processing element receiving the converted digital communication signal from the DSS processing element. However, the DSS (elements 14, 16 and 26 as indicated by the Examiner at page 10, paragraph 13 of the Office Action) does not provide a converted digital signal to the Internet processing element (elements 40, 26 and 32 as indicated by the Examiner). Alternatively, the Patterson only describes the "compressed audio and video information ... provided from the output of the DSS transport demux 16 to an MPEG decoder 18." (Patterson, col. 2, lines 64-57, emphasis added). There is no suggestion in the Patterson reference to supply a converted digital signal from the DSS processing element to the Internet processing element as recited in claim 45. Alternatively, the Patterson reference specifically teaches away from supplying the converted digital signal to the microprocessor 26 of the Patterson reference, and instead specifically directs the converted signal to the MPEG decoder.

The Legall reference also fails to teach a DSS processing element generating a converted digital signal that is supplied to an Internet processing element. Therefore, claim 45 is not obvious over combination of the cited Patterson and Legall references.

Further, the Examiner suggests that the Patterson reference teaches an Internet processing element displaying the converted digital communication signals and the converted computer network communication signals. (Claim 45). However, the Patterson reference specifically describes the microprocessor 26 forwarding, through a graphics controller 32, the internet data to a separate PIP processor 44, and further describes the digital satellite data being forwarded, not from the Internet processing element, but from an MPEG decoder 18 to the separate PIP processor 44. More specifically, the Patterson reference describes "[t]he PIP processor 44 receives the data received from the Internet through the graphics controller 32 . . . [and] receives the digital satellite data from the MPEG decoder 18." (Patterson, col. 4, lines 6-9).

Therefore, the Patterson reference does not teach or suggest an Internet processor element displaying the converted digital communication signals and/or the converted computer network communication signals.

Still further, the Examiner suggests that the Legall reference teaches a "DSS processing element generating an option palette" as recited in claim 45. However, the Legall reference does not suggest that a DSS processing element generates an option palette. The Legall reference only describes that "[t]he system 100 will output information to a display 120 ...." (Legall, col. 2, line 15). There is no suggestion that a DSS processing element generates an option palette. Further, the Patterson reference also fails to suggest "the DSS processing element [generating] an option palette ...: as expressly indicated by the Examiner (Office Action, page 10, paragraph 13). The combination of the Patterson and the Legall references fail to teach or suggest a DSS processing element generating an option palette as recited in claim 45. Therefore, claim 45 is not obvious over the cited Patterson and Legall references or their combination.

Claims 46-48 and 50 depend from claim 45. Therefore, claims 46-50 are also not obvious over the Patterson and Legall references for at least the reasons provided above.

9. The Examiner further rejected claim 49 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Patterson in view of Legall, and in further view of Maze. Applicants, however, have demonstrated above that the combination of the Patterson and Legall references fail to teach or make obvious the apparatus of claim 45. Further, the Maze reference also fails to teach or suggest a DSS processing element generating an option palette, an Internet processing element receiving converted digital communication signals from the DSS processing element, or the Internet processing element receiving the option palette from the DSS processing element. Therefore, the combination of the

Patterson, Legal and Maze references fail to teach or make claim 49 obvious for at least the reasons provided above.

Fees Due

Applicants have added new dependent claims 51-56. However, Applicants have also cancelled claims 6-9 and 28-31. Therefore, Applicants believe that no fee is due for the added new claims.

## CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that the above amendments and remarks place the pending claims in a condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Dated: February 19, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

Steven M. Freeland
Reg. No. 42,555
Attorney for Applicant(s)
(858) 552-1311

Attachments

Address all correspondence to:
FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY
Thomas F. Lebens
120 So. LaSalle Street, Ste. 1600
Chicago, IL 60603

Direct telephone inquiries to:
Steven M. Freeland
(858) 552-1311
San Diego, California Office of
FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY